[14th March 1956

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI : The difficulty is this, Sir. Pappinisseri is in the licensed area and Cherukkunnu is in the Government area. The proposal is to acquire the West Coast Electric Supply Corporation in 1957–58. So I am afraid that nothing can be done in the meantime. Once we acquire that Corporation, we can consider the suggestion of the hon. Member.

Pathway for Harijan quarters

* 3402 *Q.*—SRI M. JAGANNATHAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments and Transport be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether a memorandum, dated 1st November 1955, was received by the Government from the Harijans of Pudupakkam village, Marakanam firka in Tindivanam taluk of South Arcot district, regarding the formation of a pathway connecting the Harijan quarters with the caste Hindu locality in the village; and

(*b*) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : (*a*) No, Sir.

(*b*) Does not arise.

Pillaiyarkulam Panchayat Board

* 3403 *Q.*—SRI P. SELVARAJ (on behalf of Sri R. Krishnaswamy Naidu) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the present President of Pillaiyarkulam Panchayat Board (Srivilliputtur taluk) presented a petition, dated 23rd March 1955, regarding the misappropriation of the Board funds by the ex-President; and

(*b*) if so, the steps taken by the Government on the petition?

THE HON. SRI S. S. RAMASAMY PADAYATCHI : (*a*) Yes, Sir.

(*b*) An enquiry into the matter revealed that the ex-President had misappropriated panchayat funds and also caused pecuniary loss to the panchayat. The question of recovering the amount from him by means of surcharge proceedings apart from criminal proceedings, is engaging the attention of the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards.

States Reorganization Commission Report

* 3404 *Q.*—SRI A. M. RATHNASWAMY : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that some of the Ministers of this Government had a discussion with the Prime Minister of India regarding the States Reorganization Commission proposal;

14th March 1956]

(*b*) whether the possibilities of forming the Dakshina Pradesh were discussed; and

(*c*) whether the feelings of the people of the State were conveyed to him regarding Peermedu and Devikulam?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : (*a*) & (*b*) Yes, Sir. The discussions were of a general nature.

(*c*) The answer is in the affirmative.

SRI A. M. RATHNASWAMY : Sir, was a suggestion made at any stage in the course of the talks at Bangalore either by the Prime Minister of India or by the other participants in the talks that in view of the unprecedented commotion and confusion created in the country as a result of the publication of the States Reorganization Commission Report, this report should be shelved for some time at least?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : The discussion was of an informal nature. The very many propositions involved and the difficulties involved were discussed, and perhaps in the course of the discussion, this was also one of the points mentioned.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : I quite well remember that the Hon. the Minister for Finance made a statement before going to Bangalore that he would also be consulted along with the Hon. the Chief Minister by Pandit Nehru. If so, may I know, Sir, what was the opinion expressed by the Hon. the Minister for Finance as far as the formation of Dakshina Pradesh was concerned and what was also the opinion expressed by the Hon. the Chief Minister on the same subject? 9-10 a.m.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : If I remember aright and I think I have a fair recollection of what I stated on the floor of the House, the answer I gave was "I do not know whether I will be consulted". I do not think it will be possible to give very many details with reference to the informal discussion we have had in Bangalore.

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN : May I know whether the talks held at Bangalore related also to the settlement of the boundary questions?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : No, Sir. The question of the desirability of having bi-lingual or multi-lingual States were discussed.

SRI S. PANCHAKSHARAM : May I know whether the Hon. the Minister for Finance will be pleased to tell us whether any tentative decisions were arrived at as a result of these discussions?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I have already stated that these were informal discussions and I am sorry I do not have a record of what all had happened there, and it may not be advisable to give out also what exactly had happened, in view of the fact that it was merely an informal discussion.

[14th March 1956

SRI K. KUNHI MOHAMED SHAFEE : The Hon. the Minister for Finance was pleased to state that the feelings of the people with regard to Devikulam and Peermede were conveyed to the Prime Minister of India. May I know whether he has conveyed the feelings of Malayalees in this matter also?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Of course, the feelings of both sides were represented to him.

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM : May I know from the Hon. the Minister for Finance, what was the reply of this Government to the Prime Minister about the feelings of the people with regard to Devikulam and Peermede taluks?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : There was no question of any reply there. The point was that it had to be brought to the notice of the Prime Minister that there were strong feelings with regard to Devikulam and Peermede and that they would like to have them along with the Madras State. That was the point represented before the Prime Minister.

SRI A. M. RATHNASWAMY : May I know whether the Hon. the Minister will please to make a categorical statement on the floor of this House that in regard to disputed areas in general and in regard to particular areas, viz., Devikulam and Peermede the Central Government have accepted the principle of plebiscite?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I do not think that has been accepted, as far as I know. If the hon. Member has any further information, certainly he can pass on that information to me.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : Referring to this much discussed problem of Devikulam and Peermede taluks, may I know, when the Delegation from Madras went to New Delhi it was mooted by the Prime Minister of India and the Home Minister whether the Madras Government would compromise if Devikulam and Peermede taluks were given away to Travancore-Cochin State and the Madras State was allowed to retain Gudalur taluk? May I know, whether on that issue there was a compromise? Did the Madras Government agree to give away Devikulam and Peermede taluks to Travancore-Cochin State and to retain only Gudalur taluk in the Madras State as was alleged by Sri Panampilli Govinda Menon in a statement made at Trivandrum?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : There is a good deal of confused and wishful thinking in this matter, viz., that this Government compromised on certain issues and gave away Devikulam and Peermede taluks for Gudalur taluk or that we were prepared to give away Gudalur taluk if Devikulam and Peermede taluks were handed over to us. On the other hand, we were all along urging that Gudalur taluk should be retained in Madras and so also Devikulam and Peermede taluks should be handed over to Madras.

14th March 1956]

SRI S. RAMAMLINGAM : எல்லையில் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கும் தகராறுகள் விஷயத்தில் சம்பந்தப்பட்ட இரண்டு சர்க்கார்களும் தாங்களாகவே கூடிப் பேசி ஒரு முடிவுக்கு வர முடியாவிட்டால் அந்தத் தகராறு எல்லைக் கமிஷன் மூலமாக தீர்த்துக்கொள்ளலாம் என்பது அரசாங்கத்தினுடைய எண்ணமாக இருந்தால், அதை மத்திய சர்க்காரிடம் வலியுறுத்துவார்களா ?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : எந்த விதத்தில் கடைசியில் முடிவாகப் போகிறது என்பதைத் தீர்மானம் செய்ய வேண்டியது பார்லிமெண்டில் மக்களுடைய பிரதிநிதிகள். மக்களுடைய பிரதிநிதிகள் எப்படி முடிவு செய்கின்றார்களோ, அதை ஏற்றுக்கொண்டு நடப்பதுதான் சரி என்பது என்னுடைய தாழ்மையான அபிப்பிராயம்.

SRI M. PALANIYANDI : தேவிகுளம், பீர்மேடு சம்பந்தமாக சட்ட சபையில் எந்தக் கருத்தையும் கனம் நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள் வலியுறுத்தினார்களோ, அதையே சமீபத்தில் மேலிடத்தில் நடந்த பேச்வார்த்தைகளின்போது வலியுறுத்தினார்களா என்று அறிய விரும்புகிறேன். இந்தியப் பிரதம மந்திரி பண்டித நேரு அவர்கள் பார்லிமெண்டில் பேசும்போது, 'அங்குள்ள மக்கள் போராடவில்லை' என்று பேசியிருக்கிறார். ஆகவே, தேவிகுளம், பீர்மேடு போன்ற தகராறுள்ள பகுதிகளிலுள்ள மக்களின் எண்ணத்தை வோட்டு எடுப்பின் மூலம் தெரிந்து கொள்வதற்கு சர்க்கார் தயாராக இருக்கிறார்களா ? அங்குள்ள மக்கள் வோட்டு எடுப்பின் மூலம் தங்கள் எண்ணத்தைத் தெரிவிக்கத் தயாராக இருப்பார்கள்.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : வோட்டு எடுத்துத்தான் முடிவு செய்வதா இல்லையா என்பதை முடிவு செய்யவேண்டியது மத்திய அரசாங்கத்தினுடைய பொறுப்பு. தேவிகுளம், பீர்மேடு பகுதிகளிலுள்ள மக்களின் நிலைமை மத்திய அரசாங்கத்தில் இருப்பவர்களுக்கும் நன்றாகத் தெரியும். மத்திய அரசாங்கத்தில் இருப்பவர்கள் எங்கேயோ இருந்து வந்தவர்கள் அல்ல. அங்குள்ள நிலைமையை அனுசரித்து ஒரு நல்ல முடிவு அவர்கள் செய்வார்கள் என்று நான் நம்புகிறேன். அவர்கள் எந்த முடிவு செய்தாலும் அதை நாம் ஏற்றுக்கொள்ள வேண்டும் என்பது தான் என்னுடைய விண்ணப்பம்.

SRI K. P. GOPALAN : May I know from the Hon. Minister whether this Government have made any suggestions at the meeting to implement the recommendations of the States Reorganization Commission and leave all the disputed matters to a Boundary Commission?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : With regard to the details that were discussed at that meeting, I have already stated that the possibility of forming bi-lingual or multi-lingual States was explored. That is all and no decisions or conclusions were reached there.

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR : Will the Hon. the Minister be pleased to state whether he has met a deputation elected at a Conference of Malayalees in Kerala held at Kozhikode? This deputation was elected to represent the views of Malayalees with regard to the problem of Devikulam and Peermede taluks and also to suggest a solution to solve the difficulties that had arisen consequent on the formation of States on a linguistic basis. May I know whether their opinion was also communicated to the Central Government by this Government?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I do remember that a few persons met me from Malabar but I do not know who they were and what their representative capacity was. It is open to make any representation but it does not mean that every representation made would be passed on to the Central Government.

SRI K. T. RAJU : நம்முடைய மந்திரி சபையானது தட்சிணப் பிரதேசம் சம்பந்தமாக ஏகோபித்த ஒரு முடிவுக்கு வராத காரணத்தினால் மத்திய சர்க்காரும் ஒரு முடிவுக்கும் வரமுடியாத கஷ்டம் இருப்பதாகச் சொல்லப்படுகிறது. ஆகவே, இப்போதாவது மந்திரி சபையினர், 'தட்சிணப் பிரதேச அமைப்பை நாங்கள் ஏற்றுக்கொள்ள முடியாது' என்று ஏக மனதாக முடிவு செய்து மத்திய சர்க்காருக்கு உதவி செய்வார்களா?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : கனம் அங்கத்தினர் யோசனை கூறியதற்கு என்னுடைய மனமார்ந்த நன்றியைத் தெரிவித்துக்கொள்கிறேன். சர்க்கார் எந்தக்காலத்தில் என்ன செய்யவேண்டும் என்பது அவர்களுக்குத் தெரியும். கனம் அங்கத்தினருடைய யோசனை தேவைப்படும்போது அவரையும் நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன்.

SRI S. DAIVASIGAMONEY : Was it pressed on the side of Travancore-Cochin State that Devikulam and Peermede taluks were absolutely necessary for strengthening the position of the Congress in Travancore-Cochin State in spite of the feelings of the people in those two taluks?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I cannot say what the representation on the Travancore-Cochin side was. As far as I could understand, they also had very strong feelings with reference to the question of retention of Devikulam and Peermede taluks in Travancore-Cochin State.

SRI S. PANCHAKSHARAM : Last month, while speaking on the States Reorganization proposals, the Prime Minister of India was categorically stating that the opinion of the people in the border areas—in this connexion he particularly stressed Devikulam and Peermede areas—would be taken into account when any decision was reached. May I know whether this Government have any information about it and whether the Central Government have addressed any letter in that connexion?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : No, Sir. We have not received any such communication from the Centre. Once this is admitted, this question of plebiscite may have to be applied for all disputed areas. Therefore, that also will have to be borne in mind.

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN : Now that representative Government in Travancore-Cochin State is in a chaotic state, will this Government take advantage of the same and fish in troubled waters to annex Peermede and Devikulam taluks to our State?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : We are not in the habit of fishing in troubled waters. But if the hon. Member has any such temptation he may try it.

14th March 1956]

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : If the Government are serious in convincing us regarding their stand as far as Devikulam and Peermede taluks are concerned, why do they not come forward to refute the statement issued by Sri Panampalli Govinda Menon that the Madras State Government compromised with the Travancore-Cochin Government with regard to giving away Devikulam and Peermede taluks and retaining Gudalur taluk with the Madras State. Instead of trying to silence the Opposition why do not the Government come forward and state that they have not compromised?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : As far as I remember I have not seen the statement wherein the Hon. the Chief Minister of Travancore-Cochin State had stated that we have come to some compromise with reference to Devikulam and Peermede taluks and Gudalur taluk. What he stated, if I remember aright, was with reference to Shenkottah and even there he was not correct. We cannot be refuting every statement appearing in the papers. After all the position of this Government is well known and our bonafides need not be doubted. We need not be going about affirming these bonafides at every stage.

SRI O. KORAN : May I know, Sir, the attitude of this Government towards Gudalur? 9-20 a.m.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : The attitude is well-known and that attitude is that Gudalur should remain part of the Nilgiris district, wherever the Nilgiris district may be.

SRI K. KUNHI MOHAMED SHAFEE : Sir, may I know the nature of opinion or suggestion conveyed to the Prime Minister by our Ministers regarding the feelings of the people of Malabar district?

AN. HON. MEMBER : About what?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : We cannot be going into the feelings of every individual here. As I have already stated, it was an informal and general discussion. So, Sir, I cannot say with reference to each detail what the point made was or what the representation made was.

SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR : Sir, arising out of the answer of the Hon. Minister, am I to understand that the Nilgiris district is to go to the Karnataka State?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I do not know the wishes of the hon. Member on that point; it is quite irrelevant. As far as we are concerned, we have stated that the Nilgiris district belongs to Madras State and that position has been accepted; I do not think there is any chance of that question being re-opened even though the hon. Member may wish it.

SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR : It is not my wish. The Hon. Minister said with reference to Gudalur that it went along

with the Nilgiris district, 'wherever it might go' and arising out of that, I wanted to know whether he could clarify the doubt which it has given rise to.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Because it was well-known where the Nilgiris district belonged, I thought that it was not necessary to mention it again.

SRI V. K. RAMASWAMY MUDALIAR : Sir, the other parties are going about saying that they are more interested in the formation of pure Tamil Nad; are not the Government here equally interested in taking public opinion into consideration?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : After all political parties should exist and they should have some points to make. I think we should not deny them even that much of advantage which they should have for their existence.

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR : While answering my earlier supplementary question, the Hon. Minister stated that he did not know the representative character of the delegation that met him and that a few persons met him and that they represented nobody. May I know from the Hon. Minister whether he has received a written representation from the people stating that they represented such and such a Conference, etc., and if so, whether with reference to that the Hon. Minister is right in saying that those people did not represent anybody? May I also know whether he is aware of the fact that he, the Hon. Minister, does not represent the wishes, hopes and aspirations of Malabar or the people of Malabar, but that he represents only himself and some sections of the people, except the people of Malabar?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I do not claim to represent Malabar or the wishes of the people of Malabar. But with regard to the point mentioned, it was stated that some conference of some people was held somewhere. Not only sectional conferences are held like this; we know that even International Conferences are being held inside a room and it cannot be said that it is representative of international opinion—I made that known when Mr. Nambiar was also present. Simply because some conference of some people is held somewhere, it cannot be said that it represents the wishes of the people.

Block Development Officer, Alangudi

* 3405 *Q.*—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the Block Development Officer, one Sri S. Narayanaswamy Ayyar who started the Alangudi Block Development Area in Tiruchirappalli district was transferred from Pudukkottai at the request of the Secretary of the Pudukottai Congress Committee; and

(*b*) if so, why?